

# Exhibit 11

Notes from Panelists Interviews:

Did you read the email after you received it?

Jen - I did.

Zach - Yes.

Carlton - Yes.

Did you talk about the email during deliberations?

Jen - We did. All three of us, only to acknowledge it. Someone said, did you receive the email. I said yes, but I don't recall any conversation about it.

Zach - Yes. Our initial deliberations were right after the hearing. We scheduled a second deliberation call for the next day. When we got on the call - we all just acknowledged that we received the email. I told the group I read the email. I don't think it added anything to the case.

Carlton - No. We didn't go in depth - I just mentioned the email. I brought up the issue of the threats during the hearing and the email was another example of what I was talking about. Just validating what I said. The other board members didn't understand it in the same way that I did. My concern was there should be something where they shouldn't be able to do that - speak to hearing board members in that capacity. Similar to saying to jurors that "watch what you decide" because I have all these people behind me. You should be aware. We didn't need to be on that email. Adding members put us in the same boat as the administration. That wasn't clear to them or they were trying to influence our decision.

Did you talk about the fact that it could influence the board during deliberations?

Jen - I don't think that we did.

Zach - No. Their comment during the hearing was more problematic than the email they sent.

Carlton - I talked about how that theoretically could influence a board's decision. Not that it did, but I didn't like the fact that if it wasn't me - it could have had an adverse impact. I didn't like the principle of it.

Did you talk about the fact that this should be included in a future conduct code to prevent this communication?

Jen - We generally did. Carlton felt [REDACTED] had been threatening during the hearing. We talked about her lack of understanding about our role and she was grouping us into something much larger.

Zach - No. We didn't.

Carlton - I did say this. There was a discussion - Matt said he understood what I was saying. There needs to be something in writing, or it needs to be very clear what the board's role in the process is. A distinction between the university administration and the board members role.

Is there anything about the process that you had questions or concerns about?

Jen - No. [REDACTED] in particular, it didn't appear that they understood the process. That's just a reflection of them, not was or wasn't communicated to them about the process.

Zach - In their closing statement, they seemingly made a veiled threat that we (the hearing board) need to make the right decision because they have attorneys. I knew that it was going to be contentious given the climate, but I wasn't afraid or feel like it crossed a line. Their emotional and that's okay. Their fighting for their existence and their right to exist on the campus. I don't feel like it affected my decision making.

They brought up one thing in the email that they didn't talk about during the hearing. Could be presenting as evidence. And they had already presented that argument at the hearing for another student group.

Zach - The hearing board was upset that Karin Asher was not the complainant. Having that content perspective would have been important.

Carlton - No. It needs to be clear to them that you can't just say whatever you want. Recognize that it's inappropriate to go as far as they did.

Were there other interactions or communications that you felt were an attempt to influence the hearing?

Jen - No. I read the email but it didn't impact me in any certain way. The violation and what we were looking at was in my opinion pretty simple. We spent a lot of hours talking about what the three of us believed. My reaction was frustration given the violation we were being asked to review.

Zach - No.

Carlton - In the hearing itself - those same kind of threats in a way. I don't know that the intent was a threat - but they said there's a lot of eyes on you. That kind of thing. The decision will be heavily scrutinized. The people that they were talking to - shouldn't have been talking to us about the bigger picture.